



MARK WARDLAW
DIRECTOR

County of San Diego

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
5510 OVERLAND AVENUE, SUITE 310, SAN DIEGO, CA 92123
www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds

KATHLEEN A. FLANNERY
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR

Statement of Reasons for Exemption from Additional Environmental Review and 15183 Checklist Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15183

Date: January 18, 2018
Project Title: Steeve Tentative Parcel Map
Record ID: PDS2015-TPM-21225, LOG NO. PDS2015-ER-15-08-010
Plan Area: North County Metropolitan Subregional Plan Area
GP Designation: Semi-Rural Residential (SR-1)
Density: 1 unit per 1, 2, or 4 gross acres
Zoning: Limited Agricultural (A70)
Min. Lot Size: 1 acre
Special Area Reg.: N/A
Lot Size: 4.6 acres
Applicant: Rolf Steeve, Jr., (760) 822-4669
Staff Contact: Michelle Chan, Project Manager, Planning & Development Services
(858) 495-5428
Michelle.chan@sdcounty.ca.gov

Project Description

The proposed project is a minor subdivision to subdivide a 4.6-acre property into four lots. The project site is located at the corner of Bear Valley Parkway and Birch Avenue in the North County Metropolitan Subregional Plan Area, within unincorporated San Diego County. Access would be provided by a private driveway connecting to both Bear Valley Parkway and Birch Avenue. The proposed project would be served by on-site septic systems and imported water from the City of Escondido Water District. Earthwork will consist of 850 cubic yards of cut and 3,050 cubic yards of fill, resulting in 2,200 cubic yards of imported fill.

The project site is subject to the Semi-Rural General Plan Regional Category, Land Use Designation Semi-Rural Residential (SR-1). Zoning for the project site is Limited Agricultural (A70). The project is consistent with density and lot size requirements of the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance.

Overview

California Public Resources Code section 21083.3 and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15183 provide an exemption from additional environmental review for projects that are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was certified, except as might be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or its site. Section 15183 specifies that examination of environmental effects shall be limited to those effects

that: (1) Are peculiar to the project or the parcel on which the project would be located, and were not analyzed as significant effects in a prior EIR on the zoning action, general plan, or community plan, with which the project is consistent, (2) Are potentially significant off-site impacts and cumulative impacts which were not discussed in the prior EIR prepared for the general plan, community plan or zoning action, or (3) Are previously identified significant effects which, as a result of substantial new information which was not known at the time the EIR was certified, are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the prior EIR. Section 15183(c) further specifies that if an impact is not peculiar to the parcel or to the proposed project, has been addressed as a significant effect in the prior EIR, or can be substantially mitigated by the imposition of uniformly applied development policies or standards, then an additional EIR need not be prepared for that project solely on the basis of that impact.

General Plan Update Program EIR

The County of San Diego General Plan Update (GPU) establishes a blueprint for future land development in the unincorporated County that meets community desires and balances the environmental protection goals with the need for housing, agriculture, infrastructure, and economic vitality. The GPU applies to all of the unincorporated portions of San Diego County and directs population growth and plans for infrastructure needs, development, and resource protection. The GPU included adoption of new General Plan elements, which set the goals and policies that guide future development. It also included a corresponding land use map, a County Road Network map, updates to Community and Subregional Plans, an Implementation Plan, and other implementing policies and ordinances. The GPU focuses population growth in the western areas of the County where infrastructure and services are available in order to reduce the potential for growth in the eastern areas. The objectives of this population distribution strategy are to: 1) facilitate efficient, orderly growth by containing development within areas potentially served by the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA) or other existing infrastructure; 2) protect natural resources through the reduction of population capacity in sensitive areas; and 3) retain or enhance the character of communities within the unincorporated County. The SDCWA service area covers approximately the western one third of the unincorporated County. The SDWCA boundary generally represents where water and wastewater infrastructure currently exist. This area is more developed than the eastern areas of the unincorporated County, and would accommodate more growth under the GPU.

The GPU EIR was certified in conjunction with adoption of the GPU on August 3, 2011. The GPU EIR comprehensively evaluated environmental impacts that would result from Plan implementation, including information related to existing site conditions, analyses of the types and magnitude of project-level and cumulative environmental impacts, and feasible mitigation measures that could reduce or avoid environmental impacts.

Summary of Findings

The Steeve Tentative Parcel Map (PDS2015-TPM-21225) is consistent with the analysis performed for the GPU EIR. Further, the GPU EIR adequately anticipated and described the impacts of the proposed project, identified applicable mitigation measures necessary to reduce project specific impacts, and the project implements these mitigation measures (see [http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/PDS/gpupdate/docs/BOS_Aug2011/EIR/FEIR_7.00 - Mitigation Measures 2011.pdf](http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/PDS/gpupdate/docs/BOS_Aug2011/EIR/FEIR_7.00_-_Mitigation_Measures_2011.pdf) for complete list of GPU Mitigation Measures.

A comprehensive environmental evaluation has been completed for the project as documented in the attached §15183 Exemption Checklist. This evaluation concludes that the project qualifies for an exemption from additional environmental review because it is consistent with the development density and use characteristics established by the County of San Diego General Plan, as analyzed by the San Diego County General Plan Update Final Program EIR (GPU EIR, ER #02-ZA-001, SCH #2002111067), and all required findings can be made.

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines §15183, the project qualifies for an exemption because the following findings can be made:

1. **The project is consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified.**
The project would subdivide a 4.6-acre property into four lots, which is consistent with the Semi-Rural Residential (SR-1) development density established by the General Plan and the certified GPU EIR.
2. **There are no project specific effects which are peculiar to the project or its site, and which the GPU EIR Failed to analyze as significant effects.**
The subject property is no different than other properties in the surrounding area, and there are no project specific effects which are peculiar to the project or its site. The project site is located in an area developed with similarly sized, residential lots. The property does not support any peculiar environmental features, and the project would not result in any peculiar effects.

In addition, as explained further in the 15183 Checklist below, all project impacts were adequately analyzed by the GPU EIR. The project could result in potentially significant impacts to biological resources and noise. However, applicable mitigation measures specified within the GPU EIR have been made conditions of approval for this project.
3. **There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which the GPU EIR failed to evaluate.**
The proposed project is consistent with the density and use characteristics of the development considered by the GPU EIR and would represent a small part of the growth that was forecast for build-out of the General Plan. The GPU EIR considered the incremental impacts of the proposed project, and as explained further in the 15183 Exemption Checklist below, no potentially significant off-site or cumulative impacts have been identified which were not previously evaluated.
4. **There is no substantial new information which results in more severe impacts than anticipated by the GPU EIR.**
As explained in the 15183 exemption checklist below, no new information has been identified which would result in a determination of a more severe impact than what had been anticipated by the GPU EIR.
5. **The project will undertake feasible mitigation measures specified in the GPU EIR.**
As explained in the 15183 exemption checklist below, the project will undertake feasible mitigation measures specified in the GPU EIR. These GPU EIR mitigation measures will be undertaken through project design, compliance with regulations and ordinances, or through the project's conditions of approval.

Signature

Date

Michelle Chan

Printed Name

Project Manager

Title

CEQA Guidelines §15183 Exemption Checklist

Overview

This checklist provides an analysis of potential environmental impacts resulting from the proposed project. Following the format of CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, environmental effects are evaluated to determine if the project would result in a potentially significant impact triggering additional review under Guidelines section 15183.

- Items checked “Significant Project Impact” indicates that the project could result in a significant effect which either requires mitigation to be reduced to a less than significant level or which has a significant, unmitigated impact.
- Items checked “Impact not identified by GPU EIR” indicates the project would result in a project specific significant impact (peculiar off-site or cumulative that was not identified in the GPU EIR.
- Items checked “Substantial New Information” indicates that there is new information which leads to a determination that a project impact is more severe than what had been anticipated by the GPU EIR.

A project does not qualify for a §15183 exemption if it is determined that it would result in: 1) a peculiar impact that was not identified as a significant impact under the GPU EIR; 2) a more severe impact due to new information; or 3) a potentially significant off-site impact or cumulative impact not discussed in the GPU EIR.

A summary of staff’s analysis of each potential environmental effect is provided below the checklist for each subject area. A list of references, significance guidelines, and technical studies used to support the analysis is attached in Appendix A. Appendix B contains a list of GPU EIR mitigation measures.

| | Significant Project Impact | Impact not identified by GPU EIR | Substantial New Information |
|--|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| 1. AESTHETICS – Would the Project: | | | |
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

- 1(a) The project site is visible from public viewpoints, including the intersection of Bear Valley Parkway and Birch Avenue. However, the site is not located within a viewshed of a scenic vista. Therefore, the proposed project will not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.
- 1(b) The project site is not within the viewshed of a County or state scenic highway. The project site also does not support any significant scenic resources that would be lost or modified through development of the property.
- 1(c) The proposed project is consistent with existing community character. The project is located in an area characterized by semi-rural residential uses on similar sized lots. Therefore, the addition of four new residential lots would not substantially degrade the visual quality of the site or its surroundings.
- 1(d) Residential lighting would be required to conform to the County's Light Pollution Code. Therefore, the project would not adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to aesthetics; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

| | Significant Project Impact | Impact not identified by GPU EIR | Substantial New Information |
|--|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| 2. Agriculture/Forestry Resources | | | |
| – Would the Project: | | | |
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, or other agricultural resources, to a non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Result in the loss of forest land, conversion of forest land to non-forest use, or involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Important Farmland or other agricultural resources, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

- 2(a) The proposed project site is not designated as Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance, Prime Farmland, or Unique Farmland pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. The project site does not contain agricultural resources as defined by the County of San Diego's Guidelines for Determining Significance for Agricultural Resources. Thus, the proposed project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance, or agricultural resources to a non-agricultural use.
- 2(b) The proposed project site is not located within or adjacent to a Williamson Act contract or agriculturally zoned land.
- 2(c) There are no timberland production zones on or near the proposed project site.
- 2(d) The project site is not located near any forest lands. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss or conversion of forest lands.
- 2(e) The proposed project site is located adjacent to existing residential properties. The project site is not located adjacent to property that is considered Important Farmland or other agricultural resources. The proposed project would not result in changes to the existing environment which could result in the conversion of Important Farmland or other agricultural resources to non-agricultural uses.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to agricultural resources; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

| | Significant Project Impact | Impact not identified by GPU EIR | Substantial New Information |
|---|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| 3. Air Quality – Would the Project: | | | |
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

- 3(a) The project proposes development that was anticipated and considered by San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) growth projections used in development of the RAQS and SIP. As such, the project would not conflict with either the RAQS or the SIP. In addition, the operational emissions from the project are below screening levels, and would not violate any ambient air quality standards.
- 3(b) Emissions from the construction phase would be minimal, temporary and localized, resulting in pollutant emissions below the screening level criteria established by County air quality guidelines for determining significance. Grading operations associated with the construction of the project would be subject to the Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures. The vehicle trips generated from the proposed project would result in 48 Average Daily Trips (ADTs). According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the screening-level criteria established by the guidelines for criteria pollutants. Therefore, the project would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.
- 3(c) The project would contribute PM₁₀, NO_x, and VOCs emissions from construction/grading activities; however, the incremental increase would not exceed established screening thresholds (see question 3(b) above)).

- 3(d) The project would introduce four additional residential homes which are considered new sensitive receptors; however, the project site is not located within a quarter-mile of any identified point source of significant emissions. Similarly, the project does not propose uses or activities that would result in exposure of sensitive receptors to significant pollutant concentrations and would not place sensitive receptors near any carbon monoxide hotspots.
- 3(e) The proposed project could produce objectionable odors during construction and operation; however, these substances, if present at all, would only be in trace amounts (less than 1 µg/m³).

Conclusion

As discussed above, the proposed project would not result in any significant impacts to air quality; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

| | Significant Project Impact | Impact not identified by GPU EIR | Substantial New Information |
|--|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| 4. Biological Resources – Would the Project: | | | |
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

- 4(a) A Biological Resources Report dated July 5, 2016 was prepared for the proposed project by REC Consultants. Four habitats or land cover categories were observed on-site: developed land (0.08-acre), disturbed land (4.31 acres), non-native vegetation (0.21-acre), and non-wetland Waters of the United States (0.02-acre). No special-status plants or animals were observed on the project site. Potential impacts to migratory birds would be avoided through breeding season avoidance measures during construction. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any candidate, sensitive, or special status species.
- 4(b) A Biological Resources Report dated July 5, 2016 was prepared for the proposed project by REC Consultants. Four habitats or land cover categories were observed on-site: developed land (0.08-acre), disturbed land (4.31 acres), non-native vegetation (0.21-acre), and non-wetland Waters of the United States (0.02-acre). The non-wetland Waters of the US consists of a disturbed drainage swale that is void of vegetation. Therefore, the proposed project would not cause an adverse effect on any riparian or other sensitive natural community.
- 4(c) A Biological Resources Report dated July 5, 2016 was prepared for the proposed project by REC Consultants, which identified 0.02-acre of jurisdictional waters/streambed within the project site. The biological resources study determined that the drainage swale and bottom channel (a) do not support a predominance of hydrophytic plant species, (b) do not have a hydric soil substratum, and (c) may be an ephemeral stream; however, do not have a predominately non-soil substratum. Therefore, the drainage does not qualify as a Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO) wetland.

The proposed project will impact 0.003 acres of the non-wetland jurisdictional waters on-site. The proposed project will be conditioned to obtain the following agency permits or verification that they are not required in order to comply with State and Federal Regulations: (a) a Clean Water Act, Section 401/404 permit issued by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, (b) a Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement issued by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and (c) Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits for point source discharges and waste discharge requirements. This is identified in the GPU EIR as mitigation measure Bio-2.2.

- 4(d) Based on a review of County GIS data, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, and a Biological Resources Report, it was determined that the site is not part of a regional linkage/corridor as identified in the draft MSCP North County Plan nor is it in an area considered regionally important for wildlife dispersal.

Although the project site is not within an established wildlife corridor, there are existing native and non-native trees within and immediately adjacent to the project site. In order to ensure compliance with the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and Sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3513 of the California Fish and Game Code, and the Endangered Species Act, breeding season avoidance measures will be required as a condition of approval. Impacts to migratory songbirds and raptors are considered less than significant with this breeding season avoidance requirement.

- 4(e) The project site is located within the draft Multiple Species Conservation Plan (MSCP) North County Plan area. The project site is not located within the draft Pre-Approved

Mitigation Area (PAMA). The project would not conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources. The proposed project is consistent with the Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO).

Conclusion

The project could result in potentially significant impacts to biological resources; however, further environmental analysis is not required because:

1. No peculiar impacts to the project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. Feasible mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR will be applied to the project.

| | Significant Project Impact | Impact not identified by GPU EIR | Substantial New Information |
|--|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| 5. Cultural Resources – Would the Project: | | | |
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique geologic feature? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

- 5(a) Based on an analysis of records and a field survey of the property by a County Staff archaeologist, it has been determined that there are no historical resources within the proposed project area. Therefore, the proposed project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.
- 5(b) Based on an analysis of records and a field survey of the property by a County Staff archaeologist, it has been determined that there are no known archaeological resources within the proposed project area. Therefore, the proposed project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a known archaeological resource.

Native American consultation included a Sacred Lands check which was initiated with the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on April 17, 2015. The Sacred Lands check conducted by the NAHC resulted in positive findings. The NAHC recommended that the County contact the San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians. The NAHC provided a list of seven (7) tribes/organizations (La Jolla, Pala, Pauma, Pechanga, Rincon, San Luis Rey, Soboba) who may have information related to the subject parcel. The seven tribes were contacted on June 17, 2015, and Pala, Pauma, Rincon and Soboba responded. Concerns raised by these tribes include:

1. Notification of public review, hearings, decision, and inadvertent discoveries;
2. Copy of the cultural study;
3. Deferred to southern tribes; and
4. Archaeological monitoring to include a Luiseno Native American monitor.

Consultation meetings were held with Pala, Rincon, and San Luis Rey. Soboba deferred to southern tribes. Pauma did not request formal consultation meetings and a copy of the cultural study was provided to them. The Proposed Project has been graded historically and subsurface deposits are not anticipated. As such, archaeological monitoring is not required. All tribes involved in consultation were provided this information, and none of the tribes have disagreed with the monitoring determination. The above referenced tribes (Pala, Pauma, Rincon, San Luis Rey, and Soboba) are included in the distribution list for notification.

As considered by the GPU EIR, potential impacts to cultural resources will be mitigated through compliance with the Grading Ordinance and through conformance with the County's Cultural Resource Guidelines if unanticipated subsurface resources are encountered.

- 5(c) The project site does not contain any unique geologic features that have been listed in the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance for Unique Geology Resources nor does the site support any known geologic characteristics that have the potential to support unique geologic features.
- 5(d) A review of the County's Paleontological Resources Maps and data on San Diego County's geologic formations indicates that the project is located on Cretaceous Plutonic formations that have no potential to contain paleontological resources.

As considered by the GPU EIR, potential impacts to paleontological resources will be mitigated through ordinance compliance and through implementation of the following mitigation measures: conformance with the County's Paleontological Resource Guidelines and the Grading Ordinance if unanticipated resources are encountered.

- 5(e) Based on an analysis of records and archaeological surveys of the property, it has been determined that the project site does not include a formal cemetery or any archaeological resources that might contain interred human remains.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to cultural resources; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

| | Significant Project Impact | Impact not identified by GPU EIR | Substantial New Information |
|---|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| 6. Geology and Soils – Would the Project: | | | |
| a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, liquefaction, and/or landslides? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in an on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

- 6(a)(i) The project site is not located in a fault rupture hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California, or located within any other area with substantial evidence of a known fault. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving: rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, liquefaction, and/or landslides.
- 6(a)(ii) To ensure the structural integrity of all buildings and structures, the project must conform to the Seismic Requirements as outlined within the California Building Code. Compliance with the California Building Code and the County Building Code will ensure that the project will not result in a significant impact.
- 6(a)(iii) The project site is not located within a "Potential Liquefaction Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. In addition, the site is not underlain by poor artificial fill or located within a floodplain.
- 6(a)(iv) The site is located in a landslide susceptibility area considered to be generally susceptible to land sliding. However, based on the absence of significant slopes on or within the vicinity of the project site, the potential for slope failures can be considered negligible.
- 6(b) According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as Ramona Sandy Loam (RaB) that have a severe soil erodibility rating. However, the project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil because the project will be

required to comply with the Watershed Protection Ordinance (WPO) and Grading Ordinance which will ensure that the project would not result in any unprotected erodible soils, would not substantially alter existing drainage patterns, and would not develop steep slopes. Additionally, the project will be required to implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) to prevent fugitive sediment.

- 6(c) The project is not located on or near geological formations that are unstable or would potentially become unstable as a result of the project. Furthermore, the project will be required to comply with the WPO and Grading Ordinance which will ensure that the project would not result in any unprotected erodible soils and will not develop steep slopes that could cause landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.
- 6(d) The project is underlain by Ramona Sandy Loam (RaB), which is considered to be an expansive soil as defined within Table 18-I-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). However, the project would not result in substantial risks to life or property because compliance with the Building Code and implementation of standard engineering techniques will ensure structural safety.
- 6(e) The project will discharge domestic wastewater to on-site wastewater systems (OSWS), also known as septic systems. Discharged wastewater must conform to the Regional Water Quality Control Board's (RWQCB) applicable standards, including the Regional Basin Plan and the California Water Code. California Water Code Section 13282 allows the RWQCB to authorize a local public agency to issue permits for OSWS "to ensure that systems are adequately designed, located, sized, spaced constructed and maintained." The RWQCB with jurisdiction over San Diego County have authorized the County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health (DEH) to issue certain OSWS permits through the County and within the incorporated cities. DEH has reviewed the OSWS layout for the project and approved the project's OSWS on May 1, 2015. Therefore, the project has soils capable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems as determined by the authorized local public agency. In addition, the project will comply with the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 6, Div. 8, Chapter 3, Septic Tanks and Seepage Pits.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to/from geology/soils; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

| | Significant Project Impact | Impact not identified by GPU EIR | Substantial New Information |
|--|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| 7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions – Would the Project: | | | |
| a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

7(a) The proposed project would produce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions through construction activities, vehicle trips, and residential fuel combustion. The annual 900 metric ton carbon dioxide equivalent (MT CO₂e) screening level referenced in the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) white paper is used as a conservative screening criterion for determining which projects require further analysis and identification of project design features or potential mitigation measures with regards to GHG emissions. The proposed project falls below the screening criteria that were developed to identify project types and sizes that would have less than cumulatively considerable GHG emissions (i.e., the project would result in less than 50 single-family residential units). The screening criteria is based on various land use densities and project types. Projects that meet or fall below the screening thresholds are expected to result in 900 MT/year of GHG emissions or less and would not require additional analysis.

The project proposes a four lot subdivision that would allow a maximum of four dwelling units and therefore would fall below the screening criteria of 50 units. For projects of this size, it is presumed that the construction and operational GHG emissions would not exceed 900 MT CO₂e per year, and there would be a less-than cumulatively considerable impact. Therefore, the project would not result in a significant impact due to greenhouse gas emissions.

7(b) As described above, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to global climate change. As such, the project would be consistent with County goals and policies included in the County General Plan that address greenhouse gas reductions. The project would be consistent with emissions reduction targets of Assembly Bill 32, the Global Warming Solutions Act. Thus, the project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions of greenhouse gas emissions.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to GHG emissions; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

| | Significant Project Impact | Impact not identified by GPU EIR | Substantial New Information |
|---|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| 8. Hazards and Hazardous Materials – Would the Project: | | | |
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, or is otherwise known to have been subject to a release of hazardous substances and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| h) Propose a use, or place residents adjacent to an existing or reasonably foreseeable use that would substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies, which are capable of transmitting significant public health diseases or nuisances? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

- 8(a) A Phase I and Limited Phase II Environmental Site Assessment dated October 16, 2015 was prepared by Construction Testing & Engineering for the proposed project. The proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it does not propose the storage, use, transport, emission, or disposal of Hazardous Substances, nor are Hazardous Substances proposed or currently in use in the immediate vicinity.
- 8(b) The proposed project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste. The project site is also not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.
- 8(c) A Phase I and Limited Phase II Environmental Site Assessment dated October 16, 2015 was prepared by Construction Testing & Engineering for the proposed project. Based on the completed study and review by County staff, the project site has not been subject to a release of hazardous substances. Additionally, the project does not propose structures for human occupancy or significant linear excavation within 1,000 feet of an open, abandoned, or closed landfill, is not located on or within 250 feet of the boundary of a parcel identified as containing burn ash (from the historic burning of trash), and is not on or within 1,000 feet of a Formerly Used Defense Site. Therefore, the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment as a result of the release of hazardous substances.
- 8(d) The proposed project is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), an Airport Influence Area, or a Federal Aviation Administration Height Notification Surface. Also, the project does not propose construction of any structure equal to or greater than 150 feet in height, constituting a safety hazard to aircraft and/or operations from an airport or heliport. As such, the proposed project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.
- 8(e) The proposed project is not within one mile of a private airstrip. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.
- 8(f)(i) OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN AND MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN: The project would not interfere with this plan because it would not prohibit subsequent plans from being established or prevent the goals and objectives of existing plans from being carried out.
- 8(f)(ii) SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN: The property is not within the San Onofre emergency planning zone.
- 8(f)(iii) OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT: The project is not located along the coastal zone.
- 8(f)(iv) EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN: The project would not alter major water or energy supply infrastructure which could interfere with the plan.
- 8f)(v) DAM EVACUATION PLAN: The project is not located within a dam inundation zone.

- 8(g) While the proposed project is immediately adjacent to developed residential properties, wildlands that have the potential to support wildland fires exist in the surrounding area. However, the project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires because the project would comply with the regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the Consolidated Fire Code. Also, a Fire Service Availability Letter dated October 2, 2017 has been received from the Escondido Fire District which indicates the expected emergency travel time to the project site to be four minutes, which is within the maximum travel time allowed by the County Public Facilities Element.
- 8(h) The proposed project does not involve or support uses that would allow water to stand for a period of 72 hours or more (e.g. artificial lakes, agricultural ponds). Also, the project does not involve or support uses that would produce or collect animal waste, such as equestrian facilities, agricultural operations (chicken coops, dairies etc.), solid waste facility or other similar uses. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors which are capable of transmitting public health diseases or nuisances.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to/from hazards/hazardous materials; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

| | Significant Project Impact | Impact not identified by GPU EIR | Substantial New Information |
|---|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| 9. Hydrology and Water Quality – Would the Project: | | | |
| a) Violate any waste discharge requirements? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, could the project result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Could the proposed project cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

- | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| f) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| h) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| i) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, including County Floodplain Maps? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| j) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| k) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| l) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| m) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

- 9(a) The proposed project would require a NPDES General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activities. The project applicant has provided a Priority Development Project Stormwater Quality Management Plan (PDP SWQMP) prepared by Bill Yen and Associates, Inc. (dated March 28, 2017) which demonstrates that the project would comply with all requirements of the Watershed Protection Ordinance (WPO). The project would be required to implement site design measures, source control BMPs, and/or treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants to the maximum extent practicable. These measures would enable the project to meet waste discharge requirements as required by the San Diego Municipal Permit, as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and BMP Design Manual.
- 9(b) The project site lies within the San Dieguito hydrologic unit. According to the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list, a portion of this watershed (Pacific Ocean Shoreline, San Dieguito River, Lake Hodges, Kit Carson Creek) is impaired. Constituents of concern in the San Dieguito watershed include coliform bacteria, nutrients, sediment, lowered dissolve oxygen, and trace metals. The project could contribute to release of these pollutants; however, the project will comply with the WPO and implement site design measures,

source control BMPs, and treatment control BMPs to prevent a significant increase of pollutants to receiving waters.

- 9(c) As stated in responses 9(a) and 9(b) above, implementation of BMPs and compliance with required ordinances will ensure that project impacts are less than significant.
- 9(d) The project would obtain its water supply from the City of Escondido Water District that obtains water from surface reservoirs or other imported sources.
- 9(e) A Drainage Study (December 1, 2016) was prepared by Bill Yen & Associates, Inc. for the proposed project. It was determined that the proposed project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the project site or area. As outlined in the project's PDP SWQMP, the project would implement source control and/or treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants, including sediment from erosion or siltation, to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff.
- 9(f) A Drainage Study (December 1, 2016) was prepared by Bill Yen & Associates, Inc. for the proposed project. The proposed project would convey drainage to either natural drainage channels or approved drainage facilities. Therefore, the project would not significantly alter established drainage patterns or substantially increase the rate or amount of runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site.
- 9(g) The project does not propose to create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems.
- 9(h) The proposed project has the potential to generate pollutants; however, site design measures, source control BMPs, and treatment control BMPs would be implemented such that potential pollutants would be reduced to the maximum extent practicable. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.
- 9(i) No FEMA mapped floodplains, County-mapped floodplains or drainages with a watershed greater than 25 acres were identified on the project site.
- 9(j) No 100-year flood hazard areas were identified on the project site.
- 9(k) The project site lies outside any identified special flood hazard area.
- 9(l) The project site lies outside a mapped dam inundation area for a major dam/reservoir within San Diego County. In addition, the project is not located immediately downstream of a minor dam that could potentially flood the property.
- 9(m)(i) SEICHE: The project site is not located along the shoreline of a lake or reservoir.
- 9(m)(ii) TSUNAMI: The project site is not located in a tsunami hazard zone.
- 9(m)(iii) MUDFLOW: Mudflow is type of landslide. See response to question 6(a)(iv).

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to/from hydrology/water quality; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

| | Significant Project Impact | Impact not identified by GPU EIR | Substantial New Information |
|---|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| 10. Land Use and Planning – Would the Project: | | | |
| a) Physically divide an established community? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

- 10(a) The project does not propose any roadways or other improvements that would physically divide the community.
- 10(b) The proposed project would not conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, including policies of the General Plan and Community Plan.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to land use/planning; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

| | Significant Project Impact | Impact not identified by GPU EIR | Substantial New Information |
|--|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| 11. Mineral Resources – Would the Project: | | | |
| a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 11(a) The project site has been classified by the California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology as MRZ-3, which indicates that mineral resources are potentially present on the project site. However, the project site is surrounded by residential properties which are incompatible to future extraction of mineral resources on the project site. A future mining operation at the project site would likely create a significant impact to neighboring properties for issues such as noise, air quality, traffic, and possibly other impacts. Therefore, the project would not result in the loss of a known mineral resource because the resource has already been lost due to incompatible land uses. | | | |
| 11(b) The project site is not located in an Extractive Use Zone (S-82), nor does it have an Impact Sensitive Land Use Designation (24) with an Extractive Land Use Overlay (25). Therefore, the proposed project will not result in the loss of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site. | | | |

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to mineral resources; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

| | Significant Project Impact | Impact not identified by GPU EIR | Substantial New Information |
|---|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| 12. Noise – Would the Project: | | | |
| a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

12(a) Incorporation of a Noise Restriction Easement would ensure the proposed project would not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the General Plan, Noise Ordinance, or other applicable standards for the following reasons:

General Plan – The project is a minor subdivision for four residential lots located in the North County Metro Community Plan area. The project is subject to the County Noise Element which requires an exterior noise level threshold of 60 dBA CNEL for single family residences. Based on the noise analysis, the first floor 60 dBA CNEL would extend approximately 240 feet from Bear Valley Parkway. At this distance, ground level exterior noise sensitive land uses for all four lots would conform to the County Noise Element requirements.

Interior sound level requirements for single family residences must conform to the interior 45 CNEL threshold. The second story noise contours were also assessed and

demonstrated that the future building facades would exceed the 60 dBA CNEL threshold. This would require each home to conduct an interior noise assessment prior to issuance of any building permits. A Noise Restriction Easement dedication to the Parcel Map would be required to ensure this condition is satisfied and any improvements to door and windows are implemented to conform to the interior Noise Element policy.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36-404: Non-transportation noise generated by the project is not expected to exceed the standards of the Noise Ordinance at or beyond the project's property line. The project does not involve any permanent noise producing equipment that would exceed applicable noise levels at the adjoining property line.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36-409 & 36-310: The project is also subject to temporary construction noise requirements. The County Noise Ordinance, Section 36.408 allows an eight-hour average 75 dBA sound level limit at the boundary of an occupied structure for the operations of construction equipment. According to the project applicant, a total of two dozers, a loader/tractor, a water truck and an excavator will be required during grading activities to complete the proposed grading operations. The equipment would be spread out over the site working in different areas from 1 to 4 weeks and then relocating to a different portion of the site as needed. Although existing residences are located to the north and west, no materials processing and no blasting would occur on-site. Based on this information provided by the applicant, temporary construction noise levels would not exceed the 75 dBA eight-hour average sound level requirement.

- 12(b) The project proposes residences where low ambient vibration is essential for interior operation and/or sleeping conditions. However, the facilities are typically setback more than 50 feet from any County Circulation Element (CE) roadway using rubber-tired vehicles with projected groundborne noise or vibration contours of 38 VdB or less; any property line for parcels zoned industrial or extractive use; or any permitted extractive uses. A setback of 50 feet from the roadway centerline for heavy-duty truck activities would insure that these proposed uses or operations do not have any chance of being impacted significantly by groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels (Harris, Miller Miller and Hanson Inc., Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment 1995, Rudy Hendriks, Transportation Related Earthborne Vibrations 2002). This setback insures that this project site will not be affected by any future projects that may support sources of groundborne vibration or groundborne noise related to the adjacent roadways.

Also, the project does not propose any major, new or expanded infrastructure such as mass transit, highways or major roadways or intensive extractive industry that could generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels and impact vibration sensitive uses in the surrounding area.

Therefore, the project will not expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels on a project or cumulative level.

- 12(c) As indicated in the response listed under Section 12(a), the project would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas in the vicinity to a substantial permanent increase in noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of any applicable noise standards. Also, the project is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to direct and cumulative noise impacts over existing ambient noise levels.

- 12(d) The project does not involve any operational uses that may create substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. Also, general

construction noise is not expected to exceed the construction noise limits of the Noise Ordinance. Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation. Also, the project will not operate construction equipment in excess of 75 dB for more than an 8 hours during a 24 hour period.

12(e) The project site is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for airports or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport.

12(f) The project site is not located within a one-mile vicinity of a private airstrip.

Conclusion

The GPU EIR concluded significant and unavoidable impacts associated with the permanent increase in ambient noise levels. With implementation of mitigation measures, the GPU EIR concluded less than significant impacts associated with all other resource topics for noise. The project could result in potentially significant impacts related to noise; however, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level with mitigation incorporated. Further environmental analysis is not required because:

1. No peculiar impacts to the project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. Feasible mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR as Noi-1.1, Noi-3.2, and Noi-4.2.

13. Population and Housing – Would the Project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

☐
☐
☐

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

☐
☐
☐

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

☐
☐
☐

Discussion

13(a) The project proposes a minor subdivision of four lots for four residential units, which is consistent with the development density analyzed by the GPU EIR for this site. As such, while the project does propose new homes, the addition of four homes and associated infrastructure extensions will not induce substantial population growth in the area.

13(b) There is no existing housing on the project site; therefore, the project would not displace existing housing.

13(c) The proposed project would not displace a substantial number of people because the site does not contain residences.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to populations/housing; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

| Significant Project Impact | Impact not identified by GPU EIR | Substantial New Information |
|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|

14. Public Services – Would the Project:

a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios for fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities?

☐
☐
☐

Discussion

14(a) Based on the project's service availability forms, the project would not result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to public services; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

| Significant Project Impact | Impact not identified by GPU EIR | Substantial New Information |
|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|

15. Recreation – Would the Project:

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

☐
☐
☐

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

☐
☐
☐

Discussion

15(a) The project would incrementally increase the use of existing parks and other recreational facilities; however, the project will be required to pay fees or dedicate land for local parks pursuant to the Park Land Dedication Ordinance.

- 15(b) The project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that could have a potential adverse effect on the environment.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to recreation; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

| | Significant Project Impact | Impact not identified by GPU EIR | Substantial New Information |
|--|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| 16. Transportation and Traffic – Would the Project: | | | |
| a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of the effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths and mass transit? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

- 16(a) The proposed project will result in an additional 48 average daily trips (ADTs), which do not exceed the thresholds established by the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Transportation and Traffic. The proposed project, in combination with other cumulative projects, would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of the effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. In addition, the project would not conflict with policies related to non-motorized travel such as mass transit, pedestrian or bicycle facilities.

- 16(b) The proposed project would result in a total of 48 ADT, which does not exceed the 2400 trips (or 200 peak hour trips) required for study under the region's Congestion Management Program as developed by SANDAG.
- 16(c) The proposed project is located outside of an Airport Influence Area and is not located within two miles of a public use airport.
- 16(d) The proposed project would not alter traffic patterns, roadway design, place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways, or create curves, slopes or walls which would impede adequate sight distance on a road.
- 16(e) The Escondido Fire District and the San Diego County Fire Authority have reviewed the project and have determined that there is adequate emergency fire access.
- 16(f) The project would not result in the construction of any road improvements or new road design features that would interfere with the provision of public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities. In addition, the project does not generate sufficient travel demand to increase demand for transit, pedestrian or bicycle facilities.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to transportation/traffic; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

| | Significant Project Impact | Impact not identified by GPU EIR | Substantial New Information |
|--|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| 17. Utilities and Service Systems – Would the Project: | | | |
| a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

- f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? ☐ ☐ ☐
- g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? ☐ ☐ ☐

Discussion

- 17(a) The project will discharge domestic wastewater to on-site wastewater systems (OSWS), also known as septic systems. Discharged wastewater must conform to the Regional Water Quality Control Board's (RWQCB) applicable standards, including the Regional Basin Plan and the California Water Code. California Water Code Section 13282 allows the RWQCB to authorize a local public agency to issue permits for OSWS "to ensure that systems are adequately designed, located, sized, spaced constructed and maintained." The RWQCB with jurisdiction over San Diego County have authorized the County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health (DEH) to issue certain OSWS permits through the County and within the incorporated cities. DEH has reviewed the OSWS layout for the project and approved the project's OSWS on May 1, 2015. Therefore, the project is consistent with the wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB as determined by the authorized local public agency.
- 17(b) The proposed project involves connections from the project site to the existing water pipelines within the Bear Valley Parkway and Birch Avenue right of way. These connections would not result in additional adverse physical effects beyond those already identified in other sections of this environmental analysis.
- 17(c) The project proposes new storm water drainage facilities. However, these facilities would not result in additional adverse physical effects beyond those already identified in other sections of this environmental analysis.
- 17(d) A Service Availability Letter from the City of Escondido Water District dated February 11, 2015 has been provided which indicates that there is adequate water to serve the project.
- 17(e) The proposed project will rely completely on a private septic system for each parcel. Therefore, the proposed project will not interfere with any wastewater treatment provider's service capacity.
- 17(f) Implementation of the project would generate solid waste. All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. There are five, permitted, active landfills in San Diego County with remaining capacity to adequately serve the project.
- 17(g) The project would deposit all solid waste at a permitted solid waste facility. Therefore, the proposed project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to utilities and service systems; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

Attachments:

Appendix A – References

Appendix B – Summary of Determinations and Mitigation within the Final Environmental Impact Report, County of San Diego General Plan Update, SCH # 2002111067

Appendix A

The following is a list of project specific technical studies used to support the analysis of each potential environmental effect:

Bill Yen & Associates, Inc. (December 1, 2016). CEQA Drainage Study Steeve TPM 21225.

Bill Yen & Associates, Inc. (March 28, 2017). County of San Diego Priority Development Project (PDP) SWQMP, Steeve Subdivision, PDS2015-TPM-21225.

Construction Testing & Engineering, Inc. (October 16, 2015). Phase I and Limited Phase II Environmental Site Assessment.

Jeremy Loudon, LDN Consulting, Inc. (October 18, 2015). Noise Assessment: TPM 21225 (Steeve) Residential Development, County of San Diego, CA.

REC Consultants, Inc. (July 5, 2016). Biological Resources Letter Report for the Steeve Project, APN: 234-20-66-00; Prepared for the County of San Diego; PDS2015-TPM-21225.

For a complete list of technical studies, references, and significance guidelines used to support the analysis of the General Plan Update Final Certified Program EIR, dated August 3, 2011, please visit the County's website at:

http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/PDS/gpupdate/docs/BOS_Aug2011/EIR/FEIR_5.00_-_References_2011.pdf

Appendix B

A Summary of Determinations and Mitigation within the Final Environmental Impact Report, County of San Diego General Plan Update, SCH # 2002111067 is available on the Planning and Development Services website at:

http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds/gpupdate/GPU_FEIR_Summary_15183_Reference.pdf